DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 145 671 FL 008 876

AUTHOR	Garcia, Ricardo L.
TITLE	Learning in Two Languages.
INSTITUTION	Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, Bloomington, Ind.
PUB DATE	76
NOTE	52p.; Fastback 84
AVAILABLE FROM	Phi Delta Kappa, Box 789, Bloomington, Indiana 47401 ($.75 per copy plus $1.00 handling if payment not included, $4.00 for the Curriculum and Instruction Packet of 8 fastbacks, $37.00 for all 104 fastbacks)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Biculturalism; *Bilingual Education; Bilingualism; Educational Objectives; Educational Policy; Elementary Education; *English (Second Language); Information Sources; *Language Instruction; Language of Instruction; *Language Programs; Non English Speaking; Second Language Learning; Sociolinguistics; *Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

This booklet is a guide to the various aspects of bilingual education. It consists of the following chapters: (1) "Sink or Swim Educational Approach" (which discusses the practice of ignoring the linguistic problems of non-English-speaking children in American schools), (2) "Bilingual Instruction" (the two methods of teaching English to linguistic minority students, the native language approach and the pull-out ESL (English as a Second Language) method, are considered), (3) "The Effects of Bilingualism," (4) "Bicultural Instruction," (5) "Highlights of Bilingual Education in the United States," (6) "Social Implications of Bilingual Education," (7) "Goals and Objectives for Bilingual-Bicultural Programs," (8) "Design of Bilingual-Bicultural Education Programs," (9) "Bilingual-Bicultural Education and the Future," and (10) "Sources of Information on Bilingual-Bicultural Education." (CFM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED145671

LEARNING IN TWO LANGUAGES

By Ricardo L. Garcia

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FL008876

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 76-16879
ISBN 0-87367-084-1
Copyright © 1976 by The Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation
Bloomington, Indiana

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Sink or Swim Educational Approach 5

Bilingual Instruction 9

The Effects of Bilingualism 12

Bicultural Instruction 16

Highlights of Bilingual Education in the United States 25

Social Implications of Bilingual Education 32

Goals and Objectives for Bilingual-Bicultural Programs 36

Design of Bilingual-Bicultural Education Programs 44

Bilingual-Bicultural Education and the Future 48

Sources of Information on Bilingual-Bicultural Education 50

SINK OR SWIM EDUCATIONAL APPROACH

Picture yourself in an elementary classroom. The teacher and the other students in the class are busy, buzzing away in a strange language. You have not heard that language much because your parents and friends speak a different one. Your parents and grandparents spoke the language before you were born. Your mind drifts to your living room, where last night your parents and brothers and sisters huddled around Grandfather. He was telling wonderful stories about people who faced adverse conditions and overcame them. The warmth of your living room captivates you. Every shadow in the room takes on hidden meanings. Your brothers and sisters, too, are engrossed in the story. They are urging Grandfather to tell another story when *"¡Ai que Juanito! ¡Como eres soñador!"* (Oh Johnny! What a daydreamer you are!) The teacher, who seems to be a nice person, always scolds you for daydreaming, but it's hard to pay attention in class. The teachers and students never call you by your name. They all call you "Juanito" when your name is really "Johnny." And the classroom always feels cold. You can't understand what anybody's saying. You don't feel like you belong there. At home, it's so warm, and you belong there. You are important to your parents, your brothers and sisters. They all call you by your right name. Why can't class be like home?

I asked you to picture yourself in an elementary classroom where you don't understand the language or the culture of the teacher and students to give you the experience of thousands of youngsters who are currently attending U.S. public schools. These youngsters speak a native language that is not English. They may

speak Spanish, Choctaw, Chinese, Vietnamese, Greek, or another language. The indigenous Native-American languages, the colonial languages, and the immigrant languages are those the youngsters bring to schools in the United States. These youngsters are members of America's linguistic minority groups: Asian-Americans, Native-Americans, and Spanish-speaking Americans. Some are members of European immigrant groups.

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights reported that in 1974 more than five million linguistic minority youngsters were enrolled in public schools. These youngsters have developed attitudes, values, and concepts in a language other than English. They are normal children with all the curiosities, wonders, and fears that youngsters possess, but these attributes have developed in a non-English language and culture. So many of them are *incommunicado* in their classrooms. Usually, their teachers speak only English, and teacher aides or parents—who could be translators—are not always used by the schools. During these early school years when children should be developing pride in their own unique culture and history, some are treated as intruders in schools built on land settled by their ancestors more than 200 years ago.

These youngsters are left to sink or swim in classrooms conducted only in English. All too often they sink. Data on Mexican-American youngsters show that 45 percent drop out of school before the twelfth grade; half of those who graduate from high school read several levels below their Anglo peers, and a high percentage of Mexican-American students are placed in low ability academic tracks or special education classes. When the educational plight of Mexican-American students is compounded by the plight of other linguistic minority students whose record is just as dismal, it is apparent the sink or swim method has caused a considerable number of drownings. For example, the school attrition rate for Native-Americans is 55 percent.

We know now that the chances for school failure are related to the degree of cultural and linguistic differences the student exhibits in school. Studies report that a student's academic achievement directly relates to his self-concept. A student who feels accepted by peers, by teachers, and by other important persons in the school, and who feels he belongs in school more likely will succeed in a regular academic program. Other studies report that the ethnic minority student, especially the student

whose native language is not English, experiences a loss of self-esteem while moving through the regular, English-only academic program. This consequent loss of self-esteem negatively influences academic achievement. Low academic achievement coupled with personal frustration creates several options for the student, none of them very desirable: drop out or remain in school as an underachiever relegated to low ability or compensatory education programs.

In the past this pattern was attributed to cultural or economic aspects of the student's background which presumably caused academic "deficiencies." The assumptions generated a self-fulfilling prophecy. The reasons for failure were considered beyond the control of the school and the teacher, so little was done to prescribe an academic solution. Now attention must be focused on the victimizer, on the schooling that linguistically and culturally isolates the student in the classroom, because a disproportionate percentage of linguistic minority students exhibit low self-expectations and self-esteem as a consequence of monocultural, English-only schooling. This monolingual schooling is bound to fail. Lacking fundamental relevancy to the student's experiences, it does not accommodate his ethnic differences, meet his needs, or benefit him. It is deficient.

We need to build programs beneficial to the linguistic minority student. Just as monocultural, English-only programs benefit the majority student, we need to build programs which allow the linguistic minority to derive equal benefit from schooling. This does not require more compensatory programs. It calls for programs to provide equal educational benefit, to value linguistic diversity, and to promote ethnic pluralism in the classroom.

Bilingual-bicultural education was the means the late George I. Sanchez recommended in the early 1930s for equal educational benefits. Bilingual-bicultural education posits these principles:

A. The linguistic minority student has a right to a positive self-concept.
B. The school has the responsibility to teach the linguistic minority student his group's language and ethnic heritage.
C. All students have the right to know about the ethnic heritage of others.

D. The school has the responsibility to teach all students about the ethnic heritage of others.

These rights and responsibilities are the basis for bilingual-bicultural instruction, which has six basic elements:

1. The student is taught academic subjects in his dominant language until English is mastered sufficiently to enable learning in English.
2. The student's dominant language is taught as the first language and the student is introduced to reading and writing in this language as soon as he is ready.
3. English is taught as a second language.
4. The student is taught history and cultural heritage which reflect the value systems of speakers of both languages.
5. The student whose native language is English is taught the native language of the other children.
6. Provisions are made for increasing instructional use of both languages for both groups.

Bilingual-bicultural instruction has six elements that focus on the special needs of linguistic minority students. The list is deceptive because each element generates implications of some magnitude.

BILINGUAL INSTRUCTION

The purpose of bilingual instruction is to increase the student's academic achievement by using the native language as the primary medium while developing appropriate academic attitudes, concepts, skills, and knowledge.

Bilingual instruction uses two languages for instruction in part or all of classroom activities. One language is English, and the other is the student's dominant or native language, which is spoken in the student's home environment. English is taught as a second language, because many times the student is introduced to English when entering school. In other instances, the student may begin school with minimum English language skills. Academic instruction in most school subjects is in the student's native language, if it is the stronger language.

The two distinct ways of teaching English to linguistic minority students are the native language and English as a second language methods. The native language method, also called the dominant method, uses the student's native language in all subject areas. After learning native language listening and oral skills, the student is taught to read. Then after mastering native language reading and writing skills, the student is introduced to English. The native language method, which requires a fluent bilingual teacher who can teach language arts and other subject areas in two languages, teaches literacy in two languages.

Proponents of this method believe that basic language skills—listening, speaking, reading, and writing—should be acquired in the native language before the student is formally introduced to the English language arts. Having mastered these skills, the student should have no difficulty transferring to English. At no time

is reading of English taught until the student masters native language listening and speaking skills, at least. Proponents assume that the native language is the best medium for initial school instruction. While this assumption makes good sense—one learns best in the language one understands the most—no conclusive evidence exists to support it.

Criticisms of the native language method vary. One is that achieving native language literacy is a waste of time because the student may have little use for the native language in an English-speaking country. Other criticisms are that there aren't enough trained bilingual teachers, that the method actually requires two teachers, and that it delays learning English until the student is older, when English is harder to learn.

These criticisms are not serious. More bilingual teachers can be trained. The National Education Association and the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education have recognized and endorsed bilingual teacher education programs, and federal money is available to assist the programs. Also, the method does not require two teachers. The sophistication of the education profession, team teaching, programmed instruction, individualized instruction, paraprofessionals, and educational technology have reached the point that a monolingual teacher can manage bilingual classes. English is not delayed for long. By the end of the second year, the student is introduced to the formal study of English. In the meantime, the student catches and absorbs English almost everywhere in school except in a few classes. English vocabulary, idioms, intonation, and syntactic patterns are within the environment.

The second method, English as a second language (ESL), is also called the direct method. It teaches immediate English language skills to enable the student to communicate and receive instruction in English. The ESL pull-out system takes the student out of the classroom daily for instruction in the English language arts. The student returns to the classroom for instruction in other subjects. In this system, the student plays catch-up all of the time, both trying to learn a new language and new subject material.

The ESL intensive system immerses the student in the English language arts for intense periods of time. Sentence pattern drills, vocabulary, and idiom exercises are structured to introduce the second language gradually. After the student learns

to speak the second language, reading is introduced. When the student can read in English, he is returned to the monolingual, English classroom for instruction in all subjects. In this system, the student is segregated for intense periods of time so that interaction with peers is limited to other linguistic minority students. Because the periods of time vary and the intent of isolating the students is to meet special language needs, isolation for ESL is allowed under desegregation regulations. However, in the past, school districts have isolated linguistic minority students without knowledge of or regard for their language needs. These students were deliberately segregated in annexes and other remote areas of the school. This practice violates desegregation regulations.

The major criticism of ESL is that it ignores the student's semantic references. The student gives meaning to words, phrases, and sentences in the native language. He may transfer their meaning to the second language and thereby misinterpret the meaning. For example, in English the double negative, "I don't know nothing," is semantically incorrect. The sentence negates itself. The same double negative in Spanish, "*Yo no sabe nada*," reinforces itself. It is semantically correct because the double negative in Spanish is used to emphasize a point. If the Spanish student has not fully learned the semantics of the Spanish double negative and realized that other languages have different structures, he may incorrectly transfer meaning from one language to the other.

Both methods have distinct advantages. The native language method safeguards against semantic disorientation because the student understands instruction from the beginning. The ESL method prevents having to develop new vocabulary for some languages. So which method is better? Patricia Engle analyzed twenty-four studies to determine which method, native or ESL, worked better for the bilingual student. She concluded that the twenty-four studies provided no substantial evidence favoring one or the other.

THE EFFECTS OF BILINGUALISM

Does bilingualism retard the student's school progress in reading and language achievement? Or does bilingualism enhance the reading and language achievement of the bilingual student?

In studies of bilinguals who were instructed in their second language, which was weaker, adverse effects were shown in school progress and results. Studies conducted in 1966 in Ireland by Macnamara with bilinguals instructed in Gaelic instead of English showed a deterioration in school achievement. In the majority of Macnamara's studies on mathematics achievement, it was reported that monolinguals surpassed bilinguals in problem arithmetic (verbal reasoning) but not in mechanical arithmetic (computation). Macnamara attributed the differences between the findings to the differences in tasks. In tasks of mechanical arithmetic the subjects were required to carry out an operation with arithmetical symbols, but in tasks of problematic arithmetic the subjects were required to read and interpret prose statements.

In a 1968 study on the effects of bilingualism on reading, Kellaghan and Macnamara found that articulation and oral communication in the weaker language were slower for the bilingual and that encoding of ideas and organizing of syntactic patterns possibly occurred with less rapidity in the weaker language. The general finding that for the bilingual, reading in a weaker language takes longer than reading in the stronger was reported by studies in 1959 and 1966, with similar results from older studies. Welsh bilinguals instructed in their weaker language demonstrated progressive retardation in all areas of school

achievement (Saer, 1923). Similar retardation was reported occurring for two years of primary teaching in the vernacular in Manila (1953).

Completely relying on the findings cited would lend support to the assumption that bilingualism deters language development. Yet, in studies where the bilingual's second language was not the weaker language, and where the bilingual could develop both languages fully, language development was not impaired. Having two languages seemed to have a positive effect on school achievement. Apparently, being bilingual facilitated the bilingual's awareness of varying ways to say the same thing.

Peal and Lambert explored the effects of bilingualism on intellectual functionings. They reported in 1962 that, when socio-environmental variables were controlled, bilinguals performed better than monolinguals on verbal and nonverbal intelligence tests. The investigators reported that the bilingual students had several advantages: 1) a language asset, 2) greater cognitive flexibility, and 3) a greater ability in concept formation than the monolingual. The investigators concluded that the bilinguals appeared to have a more diversified set of mental abilities than the monolinguals.

Lambert, Just, and Segalowitz conducted a longitudinal study in 1970 of middle-class English-speaking children who were taught French, which was also used as the medium of instruction. After two years of instruction in their weaker language, the bilingual children generally improved. Even though the children were instructed in French, their weaker language, they demonstrated optimal skills in both the productive and reproductive aspects of French, and a generally excellent control of their home language, English.

In Sweden, bilingual children were organized into two groups. The experimental group of bilingual, elementary children received ten weeks of reading instruction in Pitean, the local dialect, and then were advanced to classes conducted in literary Swedish. The control group of bilinguals, who were also Pitean-Swedish speakers, received all reading instruction in literary Swedish. At the end of the first ten weeks the Pitean-taught group had progressed further in reading than the Swedish-taught group. At the end of the school year, the experimental group performed significantly better than the control group on

word recognition, speed, fluency, and accuracy of reading in literary Swedish. Beginning reading instruction in the vernacular and then switching to the school dialect had positive effects in this study (Osterberg, 1961).

Similar results were reported in studies conducted in Mexico. The test data in these studies (Barrera-Vasquez, 1953) indicated that the bilinguals, who were initially taught in the vernacular, read with greater comprehension than those initially taught in the school's Spanish. These studies also reported that bilinguals initially instructed in the vernacular achieved literacy in both languages within two years.

American studies report that Spanish-English bilingualism does not negatively affect the Mexican-American's syntactic language or sentence structure development. Peña conducted a study in 1967 to see whether Mexican-American first-graders could control basic sentence patterns of Spanish and English. Peña reported that the bilingual first-graders could utilize basic Spanish and English patterns, and that the bilinguals had little or no difficulty generating transformations in Spanish and English. Garcia conducted a study in 1973 to identify and compare the oral English syntactic or sentence patterns utilized by adolescent bilingual lower-class and middle-class Mexican-Americans. The results of the study indicated that the bilinguals used all basic patterns of standard English, and that they expressed a style consistent with their socioeconomic status. In the syntactic sense, the Mexican-Americans were considered native English speakers because they used syntactic patterns much like monolingual English speakers.

Confusion about the positive or negative effects of bilingualism on language development can be clarified by focusing attention on two problems of studies on bilingualism: 1) defining bilingualism; and 2) limiting linguistic studies of bilingualism.

First, linguists disagree on the conceptual components of bilingualism. In a 1962 survey of more than two decades of research on bilingualism, Jensen found at least twelve distinctly different definitions of bilingualism. Some linguists defined the bilingual as one who has the ability to speak two languages or one who is fluent in two languages. Some defined a bilingual as a person who has been exposed to two languages.

Second, linguists have limited studies on bilingualism to purely

linguistic variables, ignoring socio-environmental variables that play an important role in the language development of bilinguals. Fishman noted in 1968 that bilingual studies have been construed by linguists as purely linguistics and that they have failed to integrate social, cultural, and environmental variables in studying bilingual language behavior. Darcy conducted a survey in 1963 of the research related to cognitive development and bilingualism. She found that in the past the majority of American studies about the effects of bilingualism on the measurement of intelligence had been conducted on Spanish-English bilinguals without considering socio-environmental variables. She also discovered that when socio-environmental variables were controlled or accounted for that the bilinguals performed as well as monolinguals on verbal and nonverbal instruments.

What seems clear is that bilingualism is complex and must be approached from more than a purely linguistic bias. Factors related to the bilingual's socio-environmental experiences which should be considered are: 1) when the bilingual is introduced to the second language; 2) when the bilingual is taught the second language; 3) who introduces and teaches the second language; 4) the encouragement the bilingual receives to use both languages before and during schooling.

These factors indicate the bilingual's socio-environmental experiences should no longer be ignored. That a strong relationship exists, for example, between a speaker's social class and language development indicates that socio-environmental factors must be examined. Intuitively, bilingualism should enhance language development, for it gives the speaker two cognitive systems with which to manipulate a language and two cultural perspectives with which to control the environment.

BICULTURAL INSTRUCTION

The purpose of bicultural instruction is to enhance the student's self-concept by accommodating linguistic and ethnic differences. Linguistic minority students do exhibit differences traditionally viewed as deficiencies, disadvantages, or handicaps, though linguistic and ethnic differences can be used as strengths and assets the student brings to class.

Sociologists have analyzed the classroom behavior of linguistic minority and majority group students in the areas of learning and life-styles, historical perspectives, and language preferences. Majority group behaviors dominate the classroom, and teachers tend to reward majority group behavior and punish linguistic minority behavior. Thus, the linguistic minority student is punished for being himself. This chart contrasts important differences between linguistic minority and majority students:

Differences	Majority Group Students	Linguistic Minority Students
Motivational Styles	Competitive	Cooperative
Life-Styles	Individualistic	Group
Historical Perspective	Easterncentric (settling from east to west)	Group
Language Preference	English	Seminole, Chinese, etc.

Classroom experiences should be compatible with the student's life and motivational styles. This requires understanding the student's culture and life-style and understanding how life-style affects motivation. Comparative studies on the life-styles of Mexican-American and Anglo families indicate important differences in child rearing. Both family patterns stress similar school-related behaviors, but for different reasons. For example, both types of families encourage children to achieve, but the Mexican-American children are encouraged to achieve for the entire family or a group and to share. The Anglo youngsters are encouraged to achieve for the benefit of the individual youngster.

I remember a Mexican-American student who rarely worked for individual gain. She always shared what she knew, even to the extent of giving away answers on tests. I accused her of cheating; she claimed she was "sharing" her knowledge. Once I arranged the class into groups, and students were to help each other. Then each group would be tested for mastery of the lesson. My Mexican-American student researched and shared her topic with the group, and her group mastered the data. I shouldn't have been surprised. The class was compatible with her family life-style, which motivated her to learn.

Certain academic and school-related practices do not help the linguistic minority student to develop a positive self-concept. Expressive classroom competition, a value eschewed in the mainstream culture, conflicts with the cooperative orientation of some linguistic minority students. When these students resist certain forms of competition in the classroom, though capable of competing, they are marked down in grades or rewards. This practice punishes students for being themselves, and it does little that has a positive effect on their self-concepts. Other studies report that the learning styles of linguistic minority students who have been reared in extended families tend to differ considerably from the learning styles of students from nuclear families. While these findings are tentative, there is strong reason to believe that the differences in styles do exist. This may account for a student's poor reading and academic achievement, especially if teachers are unaware of the differences or if they ignore the learning styles of these students.

The linguistic minority student, identified with an ethnic or national group that speaks a non-English native language, should

not be stereotyped. For example, there are about 500,000 Native-Americans; more than 50 percent of the tribes have a low socio-economic status, yet most tribes have retained their native languages and cultures while acquiring English and some traits of the mainstream culture. The group is small, and a disproportionate number have low socioeconomic status. The group is considered bilingual and bicultural.

Do not assume that linguistic minority students are all bilingual and bicultural. Think of a thermometer on which the student can be described in degrees of bilingualism and biculturalism:

bicultural		bilingual
Choctaw culture Anglo culture		Choctaw language English
Choctaw Some Anglo culture		Choctaw language Some English
Choctaw only monocultural		Choctaw only monolingual
CULTURE	STUDENT	LANGUAGE

At the base of the thermometer the student may speak only one language and may identify with only one culture. Half way up the thermometer, the student may be to some degree bilingual and to a greater or lesser degree, bicultural. At the top, the student should be fully bilingual and bicultural. In a class of Choctaw students, some of the students may speak only Choctaw and identify only with the Choctaw culture. The students are monolingual and monocultural. Some may speak both English and Choctaw, but Choctaw may be their stronger language. Others may identify with both the Choctaw and mainstream cultures, but they may not speak Choctaw. Thus, a student can have any degree of bilingualism and biculturalism.

Bicultural instruction entails lessons in the student's native culture as well as in other cultures within the United States. The student's "native culture" includes the history and culture of the country or geographic region associated with the native lan-

guage. To comply with this requirement, teachers have tended to add a minority unit to their monocultural programs. Having the student memorize a group's contributions or string of heroes is of doubtful value when a program is essentially a monocultural process. Adding a few token units on historical events or cultural contributions is insufficient. Substantive changes in all subject areas are necessary to create a bicultural process requiring, at least, answers to two questions: 1) Is the program's content permeated with bicultural themes? 2) What type of images are evoked by the program's content?

History lessons should be permeated with bicultural themes. American history is traditionally taught with an "easterncentric" perspective of a progression from East to West. Groups encountered by the advancing easterners are depicted as obstacles of progress and civilization. For example, Native-American students learn that their ancestors were "savages" who led massacres. Rarely are Native-Americans portrayed as a people defending homes, families, and territories against the onslaught of eastern invaders. A West to East progression, as the Asian-American movement, is rarely portrayed in history books, unless it is supplemental to the development of Anglo society in the West.

An insider-outsider technique, which can be used to add bicultural themes to this "easterncentric" historical approach, asks students to examine events from the perspectives of the insiders and outsiders. A study of the Battle of the Alamo would examine the feelings and views of the Americans, of the Mexicans, and of the Mexicans who fought alongside the Americans.

I have used the language experience approach to permeate lessons with Mexican-American experiences.* This could be used with a change of context, to teach about any linguistic minority group while teaching the language arts. What follows is an adaptation of the language experience approach within a Mexican-American context.

Students are first provided with experiences in each of the five senses: sight, sound, touch, smell, taste. They then pursue, in turn, discrimination skills through reading and writing based on the sensory experiences, decoding skills through imitative

*The information on the language experience approach has been adapted from an article by the author in the December, 1974 issue of *The Reading Teacher*.

reading and writing, and divergency through creative reading and writing.

Here are some sample objectives for sensory writing and reading:

Have the student take photographs of street and *barrio* (Mexican-American neighborhood) scenes. If *barrio* scenes are not available in the community, then the reader can photograph scenes from books that depict the *barrio*. The photographs can be made into slides for a multimedia presentation. The teacher should help the student understand the importance in photography of balance, perspective, and sequence as part of discrimination skills instruction.

Have the student listen to *corridos* (Mexican-American folk ballads) recorded by Mexican-American *musicos* (musicians), and write an English prose explanation based on the English text of the *corrido*. Or have the student describe in writing the sequence, the theme, and the figures of speech of the *corridos*.

Have the student feel objects in a mystery box without seeing them and then describe the objects in writing as well as orally. Objects related to the Mexican-American experience, such as the *huelga* symbol, should be placed in the box. Or common washers used by plumbers and carpenters could be included in the box. A game similar to penny pitching, popular among some Mexican-American youngsters, is the pitching of washers into holes in the ground.

Have the student smell Mexican-American foods with eyes closed and describe the food in writing. Chili or *menudo* are recommended and can be prepared by the home economics teacher or by the cafeteria cook. The home economics students could benefit from the project as they will be exposed to ethnic cooking.

Have the student taste Mexican-American food and then describe the taste in writing. Of course, the teacher could have students prepare and then smell and taste the foods.

At this point, the student could be asked to write a synthesis essay describing the smell, touch, and other sensory impressions of the Mexican-American experience. Such an essay could be used as a narrative monologue for a multimedia presentation. Slides and *corridos* could be combined with the monologue for a presentation on the Mexican-American experience. Or the teacher

could ask students to keep a diary recording Mexican-American sensory experiences. Then students could exchange diaries. The student could begin developing a "novel" or a collection of *chistes* (Mexican-American jokes). Ultimately, students will read their own writing and that of peers.

Objectives for imitative writing and reading:

Students will read, analyze, and then write (imitatively) the prose styles of Rudolfo Anaya, Raymond Barrio, and Daniel Garza.

Students will read, analyze, and then draw or write a comic strip such as *Gordo*. Because this comic strip tends to portray Mexican-American stereotypes, at times, it is best that the animal fables from the strip be used; they are somewhat free of stereotypes.

Students will read, analyze, and then write (imitatively) the poetic styles of contemporary Mexican-American poets such as Rafael Jesus Gonzalez, Roberto Salazar, and Luis Salinas.

Students will read, analyze, and then write (imitatively) a short play such as those performed by *El Teatro Campesino*. During the Christmas season, *los pastores* (nativity plays performed during Christmas in Mexican-American communities) are also recommended.

Students will hear, read, analyze, and then write *corridos* or folk ballads. English texts are available, though the *corridos* are usually recorded in Spanish.

The second step of the design teaches decoding skills by providing reading experiences and exercises in which the reader must decode the literal and subjective messages in writings related to the Mexican-American experience. It requires the student to read closely for hidden meanings in figures of speech and imagery. In addition, Mexican-American writings provide a model for students to imitate while developing their own styles. At all times the student is asked to experience, read, and then write.

The third step of the design, creative writing and reading, teaches divergency or creativity. The student is asked to write a story, poem, or simply a description of the Mexican-American experience in the United States. Most important, students should be encouraged to use their own dialect to create reading materials for themselves and for their peers. Perhaps these reading materials could be developed into readers, such as those

of "Nat the Rat" fame, which then could be used in future years by other students.

Nonacademic areas, such as family living lessons, should be permeated with bicultural themes. What kinds of foods are included in the study of nutrition and diet? Are the foods of linguistic minority groups studied from the perspective of dietary and nutritional value? Or are they treated as novelties? What kinds of family structures and relations are studied? Are the extended and single-parent families studied for their ethnic and economic context? If these questions can't be answered with a strong yes, then the lessons are based on middle-class white values and beliefs.

Academic areas such as science and math can also be permeated with bicultural themes. Why not use the Mexican Aztec calendar to teach concepts of time? Counting devices unique to Chinese-Americans can be used in math lessons. Medicines and remedies discovered by Native-Americans can be used in natural science.

What images are evoked by the program's content? This question is especially important when teaching about a linguistic minority group. The following generalizations should be kept in mind: Linguistic groups are 1) similar, 2) different, 3) diverse, and 4) ongoing, social realities. Their political, economic, and aesthetic histories are evident in their folklore, literature, and art. Yet every group is different in many ways. While Chinese and Japanese-Americans have similar racial stock, their languages and cultures are different. Navajos and Eskimos are considered Native-Americans, but their regional cultures, climatic adaptations, and languages differ vastly. While Puerto Rican and Cuban-Americans both speak Spanish, their dialects are different.

Linguistic minority groups are diverse, each including distinct religious, political, historical, and economic subgroups. For example, at least two Mexican-American historical subgroups exist. The *Hispano* group identifies with the culture of the sixteenth-century Spaniards who colonized the upper Rio Grande valley in New Mexico. The *Mejicano* group identifies with the Mexican culture brought here by the early twentieth-century Mexican immigrants. These subgroups affiliate with right- and left-wing political parties, belong to most socioeconomic

classes—a disproportionate number are in the lower classes—and hold membership in Catholic, Protestant, and non-Christian denominations. The linguistic minority groups are also ongoing social realities. As groups, they use their native languages, belong to political or social organizations such as the Mexican-American G. I. Forum, and celebrate traditional holidays. Though each group has a unique and diverse ethnic heritage, each is also active in contemporary American society. A recent survey of representatives and senators in Congress revealed that they were concerned and involved with the causes and positions taken by their linguistic minority groups.

Using the four generalizations should counter cultural stereotyping. When stereotyping appears it should be identified—"That's a stereotype!"—so that students will be sensitized to its pernicious effect rather than be victimized by it. A stereotype is an exaggerated image or generalization of a group of people. Moreover, the stereotype lumps people together as though they all had the same qualities or characteristics. Thus, in spite of the linguistic, tribal, and regional diversity of Native-Americans in the United States, the Native-American has been stereotyped into at least three general images: 1) noble savage, 2) conquered savage, and 3) savage.

The Iroquois people were the model for the noble savage stereotype. Native-Americans were portrayed as good, honest, and fair ("noble"), but they were nevertheless uncivilized ("savage"). Thus, though Native-Americans were good, they were uncivilized because they refused to take on Anglo ways. Longfellow's "Song of Hiawatha" uses the word "savage" more than fifty times to describe Native-Americans.

The Cherokee people were the model for the conquered savage stereotype. Native-Americans were portrayed as a conquered people who had assimilated partly but not entirely into Anglo culture. These were the "almost civilized" people who were conquered and divested of most of their ways. The *American Peoples Encyclopedia* describes Native-Americans as having "adopted some of the features of civilization."

The Sioux people were the model for the savage stereotype. Native-Americans were portrayed as warriors astride a horse on the warpath. The Native-Americans with this stereotype were neither "noble" nor "civilized." Their main functions were to

wage wars and to massacre. "The only good Indian is a dead one" epitomizes the stereotype. Keep in mind that these are only three stereotypes about Native-Americans. Others could be construed. What is important to understand is that stereotypes divest people and groups of their diversity and their basic humanity. Yet, humans tend to stereotype people and then to treat them as though they were the stereotypes. Studies indicate that teachers stereotype and treat linguistic minority students similarly.

The classroom should accommodate the student's language preference. From birth the student associates certain ways of doing, feeling, and valuing through the native language. Self-expectations, self-esteem, and esteem for others are developed and the student is enculturated through the native language. If that language is not used in school to continue the enculturation process, or if it is taught in a mechanical or demeaning fashion disregarding the culture it transmits, then the student has no positive way of identifying with schooling. Because the student identifies language with culture, language rejection is considered cultural rejection. As the student's feelings of rejection intensify, self-esteem and expectations shift, and a negative self-concept develops. Eventually, the student rejects schooling.

Bicultural instruction attempts to teach respect for linguistic minority cultures. Ideally, all students should be taught about the cultures of the linguistic minority groups so that they are perceived as ongoing, evolving social realities. The bicultural process should accommodate different life, learning, and language styles, promote positive intergroup perceptions, and allow students to understand and accept their unique ethnicity as well as the ethnicity of others. Human and civil rights, the right to be different, the right to be oneself, and the right to dissent—with their concurrent responsibilities—should be inherent to the process.

HIGHLIGHTS OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

Before the Europeans arrived and colonized the United States, many non-European languages were spoken by the original settlers of the United States, the Native-Americans. The European languages of the first colonists were Spanish, French, Dutch, and English. As early as the 1550s, Spanish writers who settled in what is now the southwest United States wrote essays and poetry. The United States has a long history of linguistic diversity, especially when the later immigrant languages are added to those spoken by the European colonizers and Native-Americans. The country also has a long history of dual language instruction in public and private schools. A history of bilingual education can be divided into four time periods:

1550 to 1815: Bilingual education for religious instruction.

1816 to 1887: Bilingual education for public school instruction and maintenance of native languages.

1880 to 1960: Waning of bilingual education for religious and public school instruction.

1960 to 1975: Resurgence of bilingual education for public school instruction.

During the first period, 1550 to 1815, bilingual education was used in what is now the southwest United States. In the latter 1550s Jesuit and Franciscan missionaries used the tribal dialects to teach Christianity to southwestern Native-Americans. In the East, Native-American schools were bilingual. Run by Protestant

missionaries, the schools introduced Native-Americans to "the habits and art of civilization"—that is, the English language, Christian religion, and Anglo culture. In New England, bilingual education was introduced by the German Lutherans to teach High German. The Lutherans established bilingual seminaries to teach in both German and English. By 1775, more than 118 bilingual schools were established for the religious education of Lutheran children. By 1800, more than twenty-five Lutheran bilingual schools were established. In 1815, a conference of the Evangelical Lutheran Teachers in Virginia endorsed a resolution calling for bilingual (German/English) instruction for Lutheran students. The resolution suggested that if teachers could not teach bilingually, then the local congregations were to procure a bilingual minister who would teach bilingually for three months each year in the Lutheran schools.

Before the second period, bilingual education was used for religious instruction in church-related schools. Although the private schools continued to operate, during the second period, 1816 to 1887, free, public schools using a bilingual format arose. In 1834, a free school law passed in Pennsylvania allowed instruction in both German and English for students who did not speak English as a native language. In 1839 Ohio required German and English bilingual instruction for German-American students in elementary schools.

During the second period, eleven states enacted laws allowing bilingual instruction in schools. They were: Pennsylvania (1834), Ohio (1839), Territory of New Mexico—Arizona and New Mexico (1850), Wisconsin (1854), Illinois (1857), Iowa (1861), Kentucky and Minnesota (1867), Indiana (1869), Oregon (1872), Colorado (1887), and Nebraska (1913). Throughout most of the second period, city school districts such as Cincinnati, Dayton, Indianapolis, and Baltimore maintained bilingual public schools. In the Territory of New Mexico, provisions were made for bilingual (Spanish and English) instruction in public schools, but these were rarely implemented in the few public schools that were established during the early years of the territory.

Bilingual schools waned after a congressional commission established boarding schools and assimilation policies for Native-Americans, whose bilingual schools were a threat to the government's expansionistic plans. The boarding school's purposes were

to remove Native-American children from their homes and to eradicate their languages and cultures, replacing them with English and the Anglo culture in hopes that the children would not return to their homes. Then, after several generations, land abandoned by the assimilating Native-Americans would be available for Anglo pioneers. By 1871, the government took complete control over the schools, imposed an English-only rule, and eliminated the missionary bilingual schools. Even the schools operated by Native-Americans—such as the Cherokee system of twenty-one schools and two academies—were eliminated by government takeover. The policy precipitated the decline of Native-American literacy. The Cherokee, for example, dropped from the most literate tribe to its current status as one of the most illiterate tribes in the country.

In the third period, 1887 to 1960, both religious and public bilingual schools decreased. Yet this period saw the largest influx of non-English speaking immigrants. Between 1887 and 1920, more than twenty distinguishable European languages, other than English, were spoken by U.S. citizens. During this period numerous Asian languages were brought into the country. In addition, the tribes of Native-Americans spoke more than forty-five distinguishable dialects.

During this period of tremendous growth, language legislation was the most restrictive in the history of bilingual instruction. "English-only" statutes, enforced in most states, prohibited using any language except English as a medium of instruction in the public schools. In seven states, the statutes provided for revoking certification if a teacher was caught in the "criminal act" of using any language except English to teach in the public schools. Students who violated the English-only rules of their schools were subjected to sundry indignities, among them small fines or detention. Some teachers in the 1950s and early 1960s dared to teach in Spanish in New Mexico. Given circumstances of geographic isolation, these teachers did not lose certification—but that risk was always present.

In April, 1975, English-only statutes were still law in twelve states. Five states prohibited the use of non-English languages as a medium of instruction in the public schools: Delaware, Idaho, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Wisconsin. Seven prohibited non-English instruction in both private and public schools: Alabama,

Arkansas, Iowa, Montana, Nebraska, North Carolina, and West Virginia. Alabama's prohibition is through the first six grades, while Montana's is through the eighth grade or until the student is 16 years of age. Of the remaining thirty-eight states, some do not enforce their English-only statutes. Some states have never enacted legislation on the language of instruction for their schools. Eight states—Alaska, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Texas—have statutes that permit bilingual instruction for students whose native language is not English.

Territories or districts under jurisdiction of the United States have tended to permit non-English instruction. American Samoa has expressly permitted non-English instruction since 1962. Puerto Rico requires the use of Spanish as the medium of instruction, and English is taught as a second language in its schools. Yet, while the Philippines were under U.S. government control, English was imposed as the only medium of instruction. Students caught speaking any other language in school were punished.

The waning of bilingual schools and the sprouting of English-only statutes or laws can be attributed to the strong nationalist and isolationist sentiments that pervaded the United States. During this period, the country was engaged with two world wars, two police actions—the Spanish-American War and Korean War—as well as with other minor military incursions. The use of any language other than English was viewed as un-American or unpatriotic. Non-English speakers were viewed with suspicion, so they tended to stop speaking their native language and to discourage their children from learning it. Nonetheless, by 1959 U.S. citizens spoke more than twenty-five European languages. The ten languages with the greatest number of speakers, at that time, were: 1) Spanish; 2) Italian; 3) German; 4) Polish; 5) French; 6) Yiddish; 7) Russian; 8) Swedish; 9) Hungarian; and 10) Norwegian.

Some bilingual schools were established during the third period, notably those for Chinese, French, Greek, and Japanese-American students. The Chinese and Japanese-American schools were criticized strongly before World War II. Most of the schools were discontinued during the war, and only a few survived after the war.

In the fourth period, 1960 to 1975, bilingual schools had a resurgence. In 1966, Dade County schools were flooded with more than 20,000 Spanish-speaking students who were refugees from Cuba. Two model bilingual schools were established to accommodate the Spanish-speaking students. The Coral Way Elementary School was a completely bilingual school. Other schools in Dade County provided Spanish language arts instruction in all grades for Spanish-speaking students. The projects used federal and local funds to finance the model schools, and, in a sense, the Dade County experiment was the first time the federal government was involved in the implementation of bilingual schooling.

The passage in 1968 of Public Law 90-247, "The Bilingual Education Act," provided a catalyst for bilingual schools. This act, the seventh amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, declared, "The policy of the United States (is) to provide financial assistance to local educational agencies to develop and carry out new and imaginative elementary and secondary school programs designed to meet the special education needs . . . (of) children who come from environments where the dominant language is other than English." The act stipulated that it would be U.S. government policy to financially assist in developing and implementing bilingual education programs in public schools in the United States and its trust territories. In 1973, the name of the act was changed to the "Comprehensive Bilingual Education Amendment Act of 1973."

The act was amended to extend, improve, and expand assistance for the training of bilingual teachers and bilingual teacher trainers. In its declaration of policy, the act recognized that 1) large numbers of children have limited English-speaking ability, 2) many of these children have a cultural heritage different from English-speaking people's heritage, and 3) a primary means by which a child learns is through using his language and cultural heritage. The act provided financial assistance to extend and develop existing bilingual-bicultural programs in the public schools, to improve resource and dissemination centers, and to develop and publish bilingual-bicultural curriculum materials.

Assistance was also provided for stipends and fellowships so that teachers and teacher-educators could be trained in bilingual-

bicultural methods. According to the 1975 project summary report issued by the Office of Bilingual Education in Washington, D.C., 379 bilingual education programs received funding for the 1975-76 school year. Of those programs, 325 were in public schools, thirty-five were in colleges and universities, and nineteen were in resource and dissemination centers. The act provided more than $78 million to assist the programs, which served about 268,000 students.

These projects served sixteen different language groups in which the dominant language of instruction was not English:

A. Spanish-speaking groups
B. Chinese-speaking groups
C. Filipino-speaking groups
D. French-speaking groups
E. Greek
F. Italian
G. Indian Languages and Eskimo-speaking groups
H. Portuguese
I. Other language groups: Arabic, German (Pennsylvania Dutch) Japanese, Korean, Micronesian (Chamorro, Kussaien, Marshallese, Paulauan, Ponopean, Turkese, Ulithian, Woleian, and Yapese), Russian, Samoan, and Yiddish.

Selected subject areas are taught in English in all these projects. In addition, other federal legislation, such as Title I of the Migrant Education Act and Title VII of the Emergency School Assistance Act, as well as state legislation funded other programs.

An additional catalyst for bilingual schooling was the 1974 federal Supreme Court ruling in *Lau* v. *Nichols* that provisions for the same teachers, programs, and textbooks for all students in the San Francisco school district did not provide for equal educational benefit when a sizeable number of the students were not native English speakers. In this case, the students were Chinese-Americans who had low academic achievement and high attrition. Their native language was Chinese. While the ruling did not mandate bilingual schooling for non-English speaking or limited English-speaking students, it did stipulate that special language

programs were necessary if schools were to provide equal educational opportunity for such students. Moreover, school districts with more than twenty-five linguistic minority students must provide a special language program in all academic areas. The U.S. Office of Civil Rights can freeze the federal funds of any school district not complying with this law.

The *Lau* decision may have as much impact for linguistic minorities as *Brown* v. *Topeka Board of Education* did for blacks. While *Lau* did not establish a bilingual policy for the United States, it did legitimatize bilingualism and bilingual education in the public schools. More important, linguistic minorities no longer leave their native languages at the schoolyard gates.

This brief history of bilingual education in the United States is not all inclusive. Sporadic attempts were made to establish bilingual schools for the many Native-American tribes. Many ethnic groups attempted to establish some form of bilingual school to preserve native languages and cultures. The U.S. Office of Civil Rights played an active role in the development of bilingual programs.

The historical highlights of bilingual education reveal major shifts in its purposes. During the first period, bilingual education was used to propagate various Christian denominations; the second and third periods used it to maintain native languages and cultures except for Native-Americans. The contemporary period uses bilingual education to provide equal educational benefits for linguistic minority students.

SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Who should be taught bilingually? Currently, bilingual instruction provides equal educational opportunities for linguistic minority students, but it need not exclude other students. In 1974, Helen Wise, past president of the National Education Association, said, in a statement before the Subcommittee on Education of the House of Representatives, that she thought that bilingual education programs could be beneficial for all students regardless of their language or cultural backgrounds. What this means is that bilingual education programs can be designed so that all students could be trained to function in two languages and two cultures. Linguistic minority students can have equal educational benefits without depriving other students of their benefits.

This position assumes that the school should be instrumental in developing a bilingual-bicultural society with linguistic minority languages and cultures maintained for their political or economic value or as ends in themselves. Others have argued that bilingual education should be used to help non-English-speaking students adjust to our English-only monocultural school program. This perspective assumes that the school should help the student assimilate into the mainstream culture. Thus, *ethnic pluralism* and *cultural assimilation* have emerged in bilingual education programs as two perspectives on the appropriate role of socialization in schools.

The cultural assimilation theory emerged in the United States during the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century when large numbers of European immigrants came into the country. America was viewed as a huge melting pot in which the immigrants abandoned their former languages and cultures. The

culture of the eastern settlers was considered superior to the cultures of the immigrants. From the melting was to come a new American society that would contain the most desirable characteristics of some of the merged cultures. The public schools were to promote development of the new society by helping immigrant youngsters into the mainstream culture. The term "the melting pot" gained popularity with a play called *The Melting Pot* written by Israel Zangwill in 1908. In the play the main character, David Quixano, was a Jewish immigrant who escaped to New York City, where he achieved fame. He proclaimed America to be God's crucible where all the cultures and races of Europe were smelting into a new race. The play's title and its dominant theme led to an almost instant label for the cultural assimilation position.

At best, the theory was based on idealistic notions of society. Although it intended to homogenize some groups, the theory purportedly was consistent with democratic principles giving respect for all peoples regardless of class, color, or creed. One influential assimilationist, E. P. Cubberly, a Stanford University educational historian, thought that the cultures of the immigrants were inferior to the mainstream American culture, and that school was to be a sieve to strain out ethnic group identification and amalgamate the immigrants into the mainstream culture. Within several generations the new society would emerge, with the help of the schools.

The new society did not emerge. In 1963, a study of the melting pot was published by Nathan Glaser and Patrick Moynihan in a book called *Beyond the Melting Pot*. The study found that the ethnic groups in New York City had not disappeared. Occupations, marriages, political affiliations, and political parties were correlated to ethnic group affiliation. In other words, one's ethnic group in New York City greatly influences one's job, spouse, and politics.

The cultural assimilation theory was a new version of Anglo-conformity—the original American assimilation theory—which sought to maintain an Anglo-America by anglicizing new groups. The new theory was based on attitudes that viewed the new cultures, their institutions, and their traditions as inferior to the "American way." The school's function translated into replacing the student's culture and language with Anglo-Saxon American

culture and the English language. This process of cultural genocide alienated students from parents, home, and community. Students who could not or would not conform were relegated to remedial or compensatory status and placed in low-ability classes or special education classes even though they had no physical or mental handicap—if they were allowed to stay in school at all.

Moreover, the theory excluded the cultures of the oldest ethnic minority groups in the country—Asian, black, Native, and Spanish-speaking Americans. School policies and practices kept these groups out of the melting pot. As late as 1953, black and Mexican-American students were legally segregated in the public schools. Generally, Native-American students attended reservation schools. The notion of the melting pot in the public schools was not intended for the ethnic minority students; in fact, many of these students still attend segregated schools throughout the country. For example, many Native-American students still attend Bureau of Indian Affairs boarding schools located hundreds of miles away from their homes and families.

Cultural assimilation did not win complete favor in public education. It was challenged by another view of American society—ethnic pluralism. Ethnic pluralism as a social perspective is as old, if not older, than cultural assimilation, but it did not have the benefit of a play to popularize its notions in the United States.

Pluralists view American society as a mosaic in which all ethnic groups retain their identities while blending into the whole society. Each group thus adds to the beauty and balance of the whole society. For the pluralist, ethnicity and ethnic group affiliation are extremely important realities, for they provide an identity and protection for the individual within an ethnically diverse society.

John Dewey's philosophy of the individual and the democratic society supports the pluralistic position. Dewey believed that a democratic society could provide for the fulfillment of an individual's capabilities and that the school should perfect and conserve individual differences. A truly democratic school would allow a student to retain his ethnic heritage and identity; cultural assimilation would coerce a student into accepting a different identity and abandoning his ethnic heritage, which would be undemocratic, according to Dewey.

Dewey's notion—that a democracy should perfect and conserve individual differences—was expanded to include cultural differences by early twentieth-century scholars, especially Julius Drachsler, Horace Kallen, and I. B. Berkson, who confronted cultural assimilation as an essentially undemocratic doctrine. These scholars argued that schools based on assumptions of cultural assimilation were inimical to a democratic society and the conservation of individual differences. They called for cultural democracy in the classroom, allowing a student to retain self-identity as well as ethnic group identity.

Contemporary scholars are attempting to reconcile the positions of pluralism and assimilation to make public schools multi-ethnic. In *The Educational Needs of Minority Groups*, Castañeda advocates cultural democracy in the classroom. This form of cultural democracy presumes that the school has the responsibility to enhance the student's ethnic and self-identity as well as expose him to cultures of the mainstream ethnic groups. Under this form of cultural democracy, the student receives experiences that help to develop a bicultural identity. Along this same line, in *Teaching Strategies for Ethnic Studies*, Banks proposes multi-ethnic schools that reflect the ethnic and racial diversity of America. The National Council for the Social Studies, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, and other professional organizations have developed multi-ethnic curriculum guidelines so that school curricula could be permeated with multi-ethnic experiences and content. All students, regardless of their contact with ethnic groups, could be exposed to multi-ethnic experiences. In 1972, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education officially endorsed multicultural education. The association's policy statement, "No One Model American," summarizes the central theme of pluralism in education:

> Multicultural education is education which values cultural pluralism. Multicultural education rejects the view that schools should seek to melt away cultural differences or the view that schools should merely tolerate cultural pluralism. To endorse cultural pluralism is to endorse the principle that there is no one model American. To endorse cultural pluralism is to understand and appreciate the differences that exist among the nation's citizens. It is to see these differences as a positive force in the continuing development of a society which professes a wholesome respect for the intrinsic worth of every individual.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR BILINGUAL-BICULTURAL PROGRAMS

A bilingual-bicultural program can be based on an assimilationist and transitional or on a pluralist and maintenance perspective on the role the school should play for society. A transitional program emphasizes bilingual instruction as a method to transfer the student from the native language and culture to the mainstream English-only culture. A maintenance program emphasizes bilingual-bicultural instruction to sustain the student's native language and culture as the student learns the language and culture of mainstream American society.

Because the social perspectives of transitional and maintenance programs are diametrically opposed, the goals, activities, and outcomes of both programs differ in important ways. The major goal of a transitional program is to enable the non-English speaking student to function in an English-only, monocultural environment. The student's native language and culture are used to help move to the English language and mainstream culture of the school. A non-English speaking student who enters school receives instruction in the native language along with instruction in English; use of the native language is gradually discontinued, and the classroom medium of instruction is restricted to English. Usually, little is done to teach the student's cultural heritage, which is incidental to a transitional program. As a consequence of this program, the student should be able to function in an English-speaking monocultural environment.

The major goal of a maintenance program is for the non-English speaking student to function in bilingual and bicultural

environments. The student's native language and culture are taught concurrently with the English language and the mainstream culture. As a consequence of a maintenance program, the student should be able to function in two languages and at least two cultures.

Once a type of bilingual program is decided upon, then rationale for the program can be established. While the social perspectives and goals of the two types of programs are opposed, the rationale for both types should emphasize similar orientations focusing on three humanistic values: 1) accepting the student's home or native language, 2) respecting the student's culture and ethnicity, and 3) enhancing the student's self-concept. These values can be clustered into a core value pervading the entire rationale with an abiding respect for the individual student, especially the student's language, life-style, learning style, home environment, and ethnic experience.

Genuine respect for the student's native language and culture must be couched in the rationale. All too often a student's language is perceived as an inferior brand of the mother language, and as such, is not accepted in the classroom as a legitimate form of communication. The Mexican-American's and the Native-American's experiences in public schools are notorious examples of language rejection and disrespect. Since the early 1900s, Mexican-American students were relegated to low ability Spanish classes because they spoke what was considered an adulterated brand of Mexican Spanish. Their language was labeled pejoratively as "pocho" or "Tex-Mex," and the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights has documented instances when students were paddled for using Mexican-American Spanish in the classroom. Native-American students have experienced similar punishment for speaking their native language in Bureau of Indian Affairs schools.

Blatant forms of classroom linguistic and cultural rejection are not as rampant now as in the past. More than likely the civil rights and student rights movements have sensitized teachers to students' human and cultural rights. Nevertheless, precautions must be taken to prevent subtle forms of linguistic and cultural rejection from creeping into the bilingual program.

The rationale needs to assert a firm, unequivocal commitment to accept, use, and value the student's native language and cul-

ture, therefore recognizing, enhancing, and protecting the student's dignity and self-respect. Moreover, it must be concerned with the motivations and life-styles of its linguistic minority students when setting goals and objectives.

Rationale, goals, and objectives should be articulated so that they appear as the program's logical next step. A reader who is not familiar with the program should be able to infer both its social perspective and its rationale by reading the goals and objectives. Another way to conceptualize a bilingual program is to think of the broad components and subcomponents that exist in most programs. The components and subcomponents of a program for non-English speaking students would appear as follows:

I. The bilingual environment of the classroom.
   A. Instruction in the student's native or dominant language as the primary *medium* of instruction.
   B. Instruction in English as the secondary medium of instruction.

II. The bicultural environment of the classroom.
   A. Instruction about the student's native, home, community, and ethnic group or culture.
   B. Instruction about American ethnic and cultural groups other than the student's.

III. The bilingual-bicultural affective environment in the classroom.
   A. Experiences focused on the student's self-concept.
   B. Experiences focused on the student's concepts of others.

Goals and objectives can be matched with the components as follows:

I. The bilingual environment in the classroom.
   Goal: To develop in the student the ability to function in two languages.
   A. Instruction in the student's native language as the primary medium of instruction.
      Objective: The student will be instructed in his native language in basic subject areas, e.g., science, math, social studies.
   B. Instruction in English as the secondary medium of instruction.
      Objective: The student will receive instruction in Eng-

lish in subject areas where a knowledge of English is not essential, e.g., art, physical education, music.

Objective: The student will receive instruction in all areas of the English language arts—reading, writing, speaking, and listening.

II. The bicultural environment of the classroom.
Goal: To develop the student's ability to function in two or more cultures.
   A. Instruction about the student's ethnic minority group.
      Objective: The student will be taught the history of his native, ethnic minority group.
   B. Instruction about U.S. ethnic groups other than the student's native group.
      Objective: The student will be taught the history of U.S. ethnic groups other than his own.

      Objective: The student will be taught the arts and sciences of ethnic groups other than his own.

III. The bilingual-bicultural affective environment in the classroom.
Goal: To develop in the student a sense of respect for himself and for others.
   A. Experiences focused on the student's self-concept.
      Objective: The student will be exposed to positive academic and nonacademic experiences about his ethnic minority group.
   B. Experiences focused on the student's concept of others.
      Objective: The student will be exposed to positive academic and nonacademic experiences of groups other than his own.

These components, goals, and objectives illustrate a broadly conceived bilingual program. They focus on building respect for the student's native language and culture as well as enhancing the student's self-concept. The goals and objectives are especially applicable to primary programs, grades 1 to 3. They are also applicable to either transitional or maintenance programs. A particular program is the concern of local school district officials who know the educational needs of the community. Once given

these parameters for a program, they should be encouraged to develop goals and objectives according to local needs and specifications.

Local needs should not preclude including ethnic minority cultures not residing in the community. Setting local goals does not sanction provincialism. Many youngsters, who leave their immediate neighborhoods upon reaching adulthood, will need information and experiences to prepare them to live harmoniously in a diverse society. The bicultural components should be construed as teaching about more than one culture or group.

Determining how well and to what degree the goals and objectives have been achieved is the essential function of program evaluation. Most bilingual-bicultural programs have three strands of development: 1) language development in two different languages, 2) subject-matter mastery in school subjects or disciplines, and 3) positive attitude development toward the self and toward others. These areas should be assessed before, during, and after the student has been through the program.

Preassessment is most crucial, because the decisions made before the program starts will establish its direction and viability. First, preassessment activities should determine the student's language and subject-matter entry level skills. Language skills should be assessed in both the student's native language and the second language. With some languages, such as Spanish or French, this is a relatively easy task. With languages of Native-Americans or recent immigrants such as the Vietnamese, reliable instruments have not been designed. In most instances, the Native-American languages have not been recorded in a written language system, so instruments and methods to assess language skills must be developed locally.

Instruments being developed to assess degrees of bilingualism usually have the student speak in the languages he knows. The student's speech is recorded and analyzed for such factors as word choice, grammatical usage, and spontaneity of response to determine his dominant language. Instruments have not been designed to determine the student's degrees of bilingualism and biculturalism. Perhaps such an instrument is neither feasible nor necessary, because a trained teacher could develop techniques to assess the student's linguistic capabilities and cultural knowledge. Such techniques, based on the unique language and cul-

tural characteristics of the students, would not require the adaptation of a commercially published instrument.

A youngster's language development commonly progresses from skills in listening to skills in speaking, reading, and then writing. With the linguistic minority student, this same progression usually occurs, though the student may understand and speak a dialect of a particular language which may not follow all grammatical and lexical rules of the language. An assessment instrument based on the "pure" language may not accurately measure the youngster's dialectal language maturity. These instruments should accommodate dialectal variations for accurate assessment. The same is the case when attempting to assess the student's entry-level skills for the subject-matter areas.

Staff and materials should be assessed before beginning a program. Available bilingual teachers, teacher aides, and curriculum materials should be identified. Although certified bilingual teachers may be scarce, in many communities there is no shortage of bilingual people, who can be utilized as teacher aides or as staff and curriculum consultants.

Experience with noncertified personnel in existing bilingual-bicultural programs indicates that they are highly reliable and dedicated. Many discover that they enjoy the school setting and teaching and become interested in earning a teaching certificate. However, using noncertified individuals, which can be a method for locating and training potential bilingual teachers, should be used only after attempting to identify certified bilingual-bicultural teachers. A program should not become dependent on bilingual noncertified staff.

A shortage of appropriate curriculum materials, not traditionally provided for bilingual-bicultural programs, can be anticipated. Mexican materials, for example, are produced for Mexican students. The cultural context and the language of the materials will not necessarily be appropriate for Mexican-American students. Recently, the Council on Interracial Books for Children reported that few foreign-produced Spanish language books for children were culturally relevant to Mexican-American children. Moreover, many American children's books about the Spanish-speaking were laden with sexual and ethnic role stereotypes.

For these reasons, locally gathered and produced materials can be the best materials for a program. A Cherokee Indian bilingual program in Oklahoma developed most of its own materials using local resources. Other Native-American bilingual programs use the materials produced by the Cherokees as models, adapting them to fit the language and culture of their students. Commercial, state, and federal dissemination centers develop, produce, and sell appropriate materials. Some of these agencies are listed in the final section of this fastback.

Sometime during preassessment, a sense of the community's attitude toward language and culture should be garnered, because a program's posture and its influence on the student will be shaped by community attitudes. Experience has shown that if the community has few prejudices toward non-English languages and cultures, then the student will not resist learning a non-English language.

When the dominant language group of the community discourages the growth and use of another language, then parents may be wary and the student may be reluctant to study a second language, even if it is his native language. The student is sensitive to the sociolinguistic attitudes of the community and will tend to conform. I have known fully bilingual Spanish-English students who denied any knowledge of Spanish because of the community's prejudice against the Spanish language and Mexican culture. Many of them were warned not to speak Spanish to prevent unwarranted but predictable prejudicial acts against them.

The community's attitudes should help shape the program's approach toward the community. A communications network that informs the community of a program's activities should be maintained. Most people in the community will respond positively to the sincere efforts of the program's staff if they are informed. However, if any type of strong opposition arises, the program director should act quickly, agreeing to meet with the dissenters to resolve the problem.

Periodically while the program is operating, the staff should assess how well the program is achieving its goals and objectives. Anticipated or unanticipated quirks in the programs can be identified, and adjustments and changes can then be made. This sort of practice can help offset any serious problems.

The outcome assessment determines how well the program has achieved its goals and objectives. Outcome assessment should determine whether the student's use of two languages has improved, whether his knowledge of school subjects has increased, and whether he has developed a positive self-concept and a positive attitude toward others. Most of the data necessary to conduct the outcome assessment should be identified before the interim phases of the program's evaluation, so that during the assessment data are summarized.

Evaluation of a program should be an ongoing process that attempts to discover what good the program does for students. This is possible if the goals and objectives are stated in measurable or behavioral terms. A complex evaluation design is not necessary. Simple evaluation procedures that indicate whether the program is meeting its goals and objectives will suffice. When the program is planned, a system to check on progress should be incorporated into it. Objective instruments, such as teacher-made or commercially produced tests, anecdotal records, and other subjective instruments can be used to assess the program's effect on the student. As long as multiple instruments and methods are used for evaluation, the program can be usefully assessed. Evaluation should be part of the process of the program so that through all phases there is a method of getting feedback.

DESIGN OF BILINGUAL-BICULTURAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

The organizational design of a bilingual program should have a decentralized decision-making process to diffuse authority, strengthening involvement by giving everyone some voice. Involvement means they are investing in the program and thereby will more readily work toward its success. In particular, the design should allow for optimal community involvement of parents and others interested in the program's outcome. One reason past experimental programs have not succeeded is that those most directly affected by the program, the students and their parents, have been excluded or omitted from even minimal involvement in the program's decision-making process.

Moreover, parents of linguistic minority students have not felt welcome in many public schools. For some, schooling was an unpleasant experience. Others are reluctant to become involved because school personnel have not always been sensitive to language and cultural differences. Community involvement requires home visits with the parents and other clientele and earnest discussions regarding most aspects of the program. Once believing that they have a voice that will be heard in the program, the parents can become the program's best supporters.

The organizational units of a bilingual program should be much like those of any public school program. The four basic units are: 1) instructional, 2) management, 3) community relations, and 4) special services. Each of these interrelated and interdependent units differs from conventional public school units in emphasis and thrust. The pivot, the instructional unit, has direct contact with students. The unit's key person is the teacher,

who should be bilingual and trained in bilingual and bicultural teaching methods, but may be a monolingual teacher who is humanistically oriented. At times, these teachers have bilingual aides who are translators, clerks, or have some instructional duties.

In 1973, the National Education Association projected that at the present rate of training bilingual teachers, it would be A.D. 2000 before enough were trained to meet the present demand for bilingual teachers. Teacher training needs new dimensions. Bilingual-bicultural education teachers need interdisciplinary programs including cultural anthropology, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, ethnic history, and sociology as well as more traditional areas. An ideal bilingual-bicultural teacher would be competent in:

Teaching in the student's native language (as well as English) in content areas such as math, science, social studies, etc.;
Teaching the language arts and reading in the student's native language as well as English;
Teaching about the heritage of the student's native culture as well as that of the mainstream culture;
Understanding and applying fundamental contrastive linguistic techniques, especially to the student's native language and English;
Understanding and accommodating the various learning styles of students;
Assessing learning, student interests, and academic achievement without ethnic or linguistic biases;
Developing or adapting materials that are free of ethnic stereotypes.

The teacher's primary responsibility is to provide bilingual and bicultural experiences. This includes using the student's native language as a medium of instruction, bilingual-bicultural materials, bilingual-bicultural aides, and evaluation techniques compatible with the student's ethnic and cultural experiences.

Without a humanistic orientation, a teacher cannot succeed in a bilingual program. The teacher must be able to respect the student as an individual and as a member of an ethnic group. Adjustments should be made to lower the student-teacher ratio, to allow time to individualize instruction, and to provide bilingual aides. An effective bilingual teacher should be rewarded.

The second key unit is the community advisory group of parents and adults who have a genuine concern for the success of the program. Some groups are policy-making boards with power

to determine the programs' philosophy, rationale, goals, and objectives. Other groups only advise. The group as a whole should consider the unique needs of the students in the program. Although they should be aware of community politics, their advice should be based on what seems best for the students. It is especially important that the group-members are representative of students. Essentially, this unit should provide genuine input on the educational needs and concerns of the students as well as evaluate the program's successes and failures.

The advisory group should be involved in all stages of the program. Once the program has been conceptualized, the group's involvement should be:

1. The implementation stage—clarifying the program's objectives, setting a realistic schedule for accomplishment of the objectives, and deciding upon a workable plan by which the group can conduct ongoing evaluation of the program.
2. The development stage—checking the program's progress and responding to community concerns. The group should also provide guidance as issues arise.
3. The evaluation stage—assessing the program's progress. As the program matures, the group should develop a routine by which they can assess whether the program is working toward its goals and objectives.

If the tasks of the advisory group are considered fundamental to the success of the program, the group will be extremely helpful in achieving the program's goals. If the tasks are considered menial or unimportant, the group may become passive or aggressive, which can mean failure for the program. The advisory board should be congruous with the linguistic minority community. It can provide names of local agencies, local organizations, and other vital resources as well as impetus and support for a program.

The management unit of a program has three basic responsibilities: 1) establishing and maintaining the legitimacy of the program, 2) providing inservice training and other staff development activities, and 3) performing routine administrative matters. To establish and maintain the legitimacy of the program, the administrator of the management unit (who might be a school principal, a coordinator, or a director of the program) should build rapport with the monolingual staff so that they will accept it as part of the overall program within a school. As the program matures, monolingual and bilingual staff members should be

encouraged to share information and experiences with hopes that some will start to team teach. Positive, cooperative efforts among the staff, encouraged by the program's administrator, should lead to its acceptance and integration into the total school curriculum.

The program administrator should provide staff development and inservice training for bilingual staff members. Training would include additional information for producing materials and improving instruction. Also, the staff should have time to share concerns, ideas, and insights, providing opportunities to build staff camaraderie and a sense of unity. The staff should be rewarded for their efforts, and meaningful inservice training can reward the staff as well as regenerate it. Whenever possible, including monolingual staff members for inservice is desirable to increase their awareness of the program's activities, goals, and objectives.

The administrator should be highly visible within the school, in the advisory group, and within the community served by the program. Memos and messages must be written in the native language for parents who may not read English. The program administrator should be bilingual and sensitive to the community.

Special services, a catch-all unit designed according to student needs and the resources available, may put individuals into roles of home visitors, social workers, guidance counselors, or curriculum materials developers. Depending on the needs and resources, the special services unit can be utilized to develop community and staff rapport, to assist in staff development, and to provide specialized input. Initially, a curriculum materials developer who produced multimedia materials based on the teachers' specifications and situations would be invaluable. Once ample materials are produced, then attention should shift to other areas, such as home visitations.

This unit should be the most flexible so that its functions can change as some needs are met and others arise. Persons hired for this unit should be bilingual and capable of shifting and redefining their roles as the program changes. Noncertified personnel might best fit into the special services unit. They are not limited nor constrained by specialized training or credentials, yet, they can be trained to assume various roles not needing certification.

BILINGUAL-BICULTURAL EDUCATION AND THE FUTURE

The United States is a multilingual society. Historical analysis shows that the country always has been multilingual, and today numerous non-English languages are spoken in the United States. Presently, bilingual-bicultural education is used to provide equal educational opportunity for students who do not speak English or who are limited in their English-speaking abilities because their native language is not English.

What can safely be said about bilingual-bicultural education? First, that while no single best bilingual method exists, a systematic approach of instruction based on an understanding of the student's language and culture can produce a positive effect. Second, students vary linguistically and culturally. Moreover, bilingualism itself does not handicap linguistic minority students. What causes handicaps for these students are such factors as the student's socioeconomic status, community attitudes toward the student's native language, and educational policies and procedures regarding the native-language. Third, the teacher's attitude toward the native language and culture is the single most potent factor influencing the linguistic minority student's attitude toward learning.

A recurring issue is whether the existence of non-English languages and cultures should be encouraged. Federal legislation on bilingual education acknowledges the existence of non-English languages. It provides financial assistance for both maintenance and transitional bilingual education programs. The spirit of the legislation encourages the study of non-English languages and cultures in the public schools, though it does not endorse any language as the official language of the country.

However, current bilingual-bicultural programs result from pressures and concerns regarding the unequal education that English-only school programs provide for linguistic minority students. Groups using bilingual education should not be construed as wanting to separate from the general American society. Present bilingual-bicultural education should lead to greater participation by these groups in the general American society. As the groups progress in the development and use of English, they will be better able to participate in all arenas of society—especially in the economic and political. Bilingual-bicultural children's television and bilingual public documents are two indications of the increased social and political involvement of linguistic ethnic minority groups.

Bilingual-bicultural education will continue to grow as more communities assess the local needs of their linguistic minority populations. Federal and state support of bilingual-bicultural programs will increase or remain stable. Eventually, school districts will not need state and federal support to the extent they now do. As the programs mature and stabilize, they will be absorbed into the local school curricula, especially as majority group parents learn the benefits the program can provide for their children. A problem faced by some federally bilingual projects—inability to absorb all majority students who would like to enroll—is positive because the programs have gained strong community support and will be successful so long as they respond to the concerns of their communities.

The societal benefit of bilingual-bicultural education is greater than what, at first glance, is apparent. As we enter the fourth quarter of the twentieth century, we recognize the urgency of cross-cultural understandings. Our society and our globe are shrinking in social distance, requiring more human contact and better communication. In *Future Shock*, Toffler alerts us to the immense diversity we face as a global society. We should remember that the students we are now educating will live in the twenty-first century. They will be confronted by an incomprehensible amount of human diversity that will cross ethnic, linguistic, and racial lines. Surely, bilingual-bicultural education will contribute to better cross-cultural and human understandings in the coming years while it provides equal educational benefit to linguistic minority students today.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION ON BILINGUAL-BICULTURAL EDUCATION

For information on federal programs, funding, and legislation, contact:

Dr. John Molina, Director
Bureau of Bilingual Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Washington, D.C. 20201

For information on state programs, funding, and legislation, contact the state department of education of your state.

For research and development on bilingual-bicultural education programs, contact:

Center for Applied Linguistics
1611 North Kent Street
Arlington, VA 22209

ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools
New Mexico State University
P.O. Box 3 AP
Las Cruces, NM 88003

For information on legal matters related to bilingual-bicultural education, contact:

Office of Civil Rights
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Washington, D.C. 20201

For scholarly and theoretical information on bilingual-bicultural education, read:

Fishman, J. A. *Language Loyalty in the United States.* The Hague, The Netherlands: Mouton and Co., 1966.

Engle, Patricia Lee. *The Use of Vernacular Languages in Education.* Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1975.

Paulston, Christina. *Implications of Language Learning Theory for Language Planning: Concerns in Bilingual Education.* Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1974.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. *A Better Chance to Learn: Bilingual-Bicultural Education.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, May, 1975.

For references on bilingualism and language development:

Alatis, James E. *Monograph Series on Language and Literature.* Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1970.

Barrera-Vasquez, A. *The Tarascan Project in Mexico: Use of Vernacular Languages in Education.* Paris: Unesco, 1953, pp. 77-86.

Bernstein, Basil. "Social Class, Linguistic Codes, and Grammatical Elements." *Language and Speech,* April, 1965, pp. 221-41.

Darcy, Natalie T. "Bilingualism and the Measurement of Intelligence." *Journal of Genetic Psychology,* June, 1963, pp. 259-82.

Fishman, Joshua. "Sociolinguistic Perspective on the Study of Bilingualism." *Linguistics,* May, 1968, pp. 21-49.

Garcia, Ricardo L. "Identification and Comparison of Oral English Syntactic Patterns of Spanish-English Speaking Adolescent Hispanos." Doctoral dissertation, University of Denver, 1973, pp. 86-100.

Jensen, J. V. "Effects of Childhood Bilingualism II." *Elementary English,* January, 1962, pp. 132-43.

Kolers, Paul A. "Reading and Talking Bilingually." *American Journal of Psychology,* March, 1966, pp. 357-76.

Lambert, Wallace; Havelka, J.; and Gardner, R. C. "Linguistic Manifestations of Bilingualism." *American Journal of Psychology,* January, 1959, pp. 72-82.

Lambert, Wallace; Just, M.; and Segalowitz, N. "Some Cognitive Consequences of Following the Curricula of the Early School Grades in a Foreign Language." *Monograph Series on Language and Linguistics,* edited by James E. Alatis. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1970, pp. 259-67.

Macnamara, John. *Bilingualism in Primary Education.* Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press, 1966, chapter 6.

_____. "Reading in a Second Language." *Improving Reading Throughout the World,* edited by Marion Jenkinson. Newark, N.J.: International Reading Association, 1968, chapter 5.

Manila Department of Education. *The Relative Effectiveness of the Vernacular and of English as Media of Instruction.* Manila: Bureau of Public Schools, 1953, chapter 14.

Peal, Elizabeth and Lambert, Wallace. *The Relation of Bilingualism to Intelligence.* Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, 1962, p. 27.

Peña, Albar A. *A Comparative Study of Selected Syntactical Structures of the Oral Language Status in Spanish and English of Disadvantaged First-Grade Spanish-Speaking Children.* Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1967.

Saer, D. J. "The Effects of Bilingualism on Intelligence." *British Journal of Psychology,* April-July, 1923, pp. 25-38.

Weinreich, Uriel. *Languages in Contact.* New York: Linguistic Circle of New York, 1953.

For information and materials on bilingual-bicultural education:

Asian American Studies Center
Box 24A43
Los Angeles, CA 94104

Bay Area Bilingual Education League (BABEL)
Berkeley Unified School District
1414 Walnut St.
Berkeley, CA 94709

Bilingual Education Services
P.O. Box 669
1508 Oxley St.
South Pasadena, CA 91030

Council on Interracial Books for Children
1841 Broadway
New York, NY 10023

Dissemination Center for Bilingual-Bicultural Education
6504 Tracor Lane
Austin, TX 78721

Early Childhood Bilingual Education
Ferkauf Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences
Yeshiva University
55 Fifth Ave.
New York, NY 10003

Indian Historical Society
1451 Masonic Ave.
San Francisco, CA 94117

International Center for Research on Bilingualism
Cite Universitaire
Quebec 10, P. Q., Canada

Johnson Publishing Company
820 South Michigan Ave.
Chicago, IL 60605

Materiales en Marcha
2950 National Ave.
San Diego, CA 92113

Puerto Rican Research and Resource Center
1529 Connecticut Ave., NW
Washington, D.C. 20036

Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory
117 Richmond Dr., N.E.
Albuquerque, NM 87106

Spanish Curricula Development Center
Dade County Public Schools
1420 Washington Ave.
Miami Beach, FL 33139